

REMARKS

Claims 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 21-30 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 20, 26-28 have been amended.

In the Office Action mailed July 3, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 11-12, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-31 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,650,649 B1 by Brown, et al (hereinafter “Brown”).

Applicants respectfully respond to this Office Action.

Claims 26-28 are objected to because they depend on cancelled claim 1. As requested by the Examiner, claims 26-28 have been amended to indicate the correct dependency to claim 20.

35 U.S.C. §102

The standard for anticipation under §102 requires “the presence in a single prior art disclosure of all elements of a claimed invention arranged as in that claim.” *Carella v. Starlight Archery & Pro Line Co.*, 804 F.2d 135, 138, 231 U.S.P.Q.D (BNA) 644, 646 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (*quoting Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 774 F.2d 1082, 1101, 227 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 337, 350 (Fed. Cir. 1985)) (*additional citations omitted*). As discussed further below, the Examiner has failed to identify each and every claim limitation, and has therefore failed to set forth a prima facie case for anticipation as required by §102.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization of Brown. Brown teaches a particular processor architecture suited for performing various chip rate-processing functions for RAKE receivers. The correlator coprocessor (CCP) taught in Brown may also be used for a variety of estimation and search/acquisition functions. The CCP is designed to perform a variety of tasks, which may include search tasks, as the examiner correctly points out. However, contrary to the Examiner’s characterization, Brown does not teach interrupting a first search task in progress, performing a second search task, and then continuing to perform a first search task. In all of the Examiner’s citations from Brown, it is seen that there is no mention of interrupting a task and returning to it. Furthermore, the cited references do not mention storing

and selecting partial results, as taught throughout various of the pending claims. Applicants do not find such teaching anywhere else in the Brown reference either.

To the contrary, Brown teaches performing tasks in order, and to their completion. Various citations throughout the reference may be found to support this, such as column 8 lines 49-53, where a PSC search task must be the first task to run. Various result buffers, such as DPE buffer 114, LCI buffer 115, EOL buffer 116 and similar buffers are “single-buffered, and.. new results over-write old ones” e.g. column 10 lines 61-62 and column 11 lines 3-5. The ordering of tasks is further detailed in columns 13 lines 28-64, for example. Here it is shown that tasks are in one of four states: stopped, waiting to run, running or waiting to stop. “Once a task begins executing, it will execute forever (until stopped by SW) or until a well defined end time.” Column 13 lines 57-59. These are but examples of the teachings, throughout Brown, indicating that tasks are to be placed in the task buffer and performed in order until the task is completed. The Examiner’s citation of column 23 line 23 through column 24 line 32 provides more detail on the state transitions for task processing.

Again, the cited reference does not mention storing or selecting partial results. Neither is there any teaching of interrupting or restarting a task. These are but example teachings throughout the Brown reference that indicate that the system in Brown does not teach or anticipate the limitations of the pending claims.

With respect to claim 11, Brown is silent as to interrupting a first search task in progress, storing state information for the first search task, and, subsequent to performing a second search task, continuing the first task using accessed state information.

With respect to claim 12, Brown is silent as to storing partial results for a first task, and reselecting those partial results from a first storage element before returning to a first search task. As before, with claim 11, Brown is also silent as to interrupting a first search task to perform a second search task. For these same reasons, Brown is silent as to the teachings of claims 14-15, and 17-18, as well.

Claim 20 has been amended to clarify the intended scope. A selector for selecting one of the two or more storage elements in performing two or more search tasks has been added, in similar fashion to the other pending claims. Brown fails to teach these limitations, for the reasons stated above. As such, dependent claims 21-28 should now be in a condition for allowance as well.

With respect to the Examiner's characterization of Brown teaching the limitations of claims 21-25, it is unclear where in the citation it is taught how the two or more storage elements interact with the various components, as required by the limitations of the pending claims. Nonetheless, the amendment to claim 20 should clear up any remaining issues.

With respect to claim 24, Applicants note that Brown is absolutely silent as to a peak detector, or similar teaching. With respect to claim 25 Brown is equally silent with respect to teaching a sorter. Neither of these elements is discussed in any way in Brown.

With respect to claims 29-31, similar arguments to those described above continue to hold. Furthermore, Applicants note that Brown does not teach partitioning a search task into a plurality of segments. As noted above, Brown teaches performing an entire search task to completion, as detailed in the various examples given. Brown does not, in the cited portion, nor in any other place as far as Applicants can tell, teach partitioning a first search task into a plurality of search segments, the length of time to process each segment being less than or equal to a contiguous segment of time allotted for processing the first search task. Again, Brown does not teach the concept of the plurality of storage elements, as argued above. Finally, Brown is silent as to performing alternate search tasks in time periods between the processing of the plurality of search segments of the first search task.

**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/3/06

By: /George C. Pappas/  
George C. Pappas, Reg. No. 35,065  
858-651-1306

QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121  
Telephone: (858) 651-4125  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502